

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,704	05/23/2001	Lakshmi Arunachalam	002435.P002X	1786

7590 08/18/2004

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,704

Applicant(s)

ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/13/01.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1) The examiner has received the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), filed August 13, 2001. All U.S. Patent Documents were considered. The Non Patent Literature Documents (NPL), were not considered because the applicant failed to supply a copy of the documents. A request for the documents was made on August 10, 2004, by the examiner in a phone call to Brent Vecchia attorney Docket No. 002435.P002. All NPL documents will therefore be considered once received by the examiner in future communications with the applicant.

Specification

1) The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

1) Claim 12 is objected to because of the following minor informality: There is a word missing (i.e. "to"), between "object", and "determine", in the last 3 lines of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

2) Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: The wording of claim 14 makes the claim unclear. Appropriate correction is required. In order for the examiner to advance prosecution of the application for patent the examiner has interpreted the claim as understood.

3) Claim 15 is objected to because of the following minor informality: The word "wherein" in the first line was mistakenly repeated. One of these words needs to be removed. Appropriate correction is required.

4) Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: The wording of claim 19 makes the claim unclear. Appropriate correction is required. In order for the examiner to advance prosecution of the application for patent the examiner has interpreted the claim as understood.

5) Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: The wording of claim 21 is inconsistent with independent claim 18. Appropriate correction is required. In order for the examiner to advance prosecution of the application for patent the examiner has interpreted the claim to read as follows:

"The system of claim 18, further comprising a remote software object associated with the **transactional application** functionally interposed between the **network access device** and an enterprise computer system of a service provider participant to

interface with the enterprise computer system and utilize data of the enterprise computer system in a method."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1) The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2) Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3) Claim 5 recites the limitation "the hub" in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order for the examiner to advance prosecution of the application for patent the examiner has interpreted the claim as understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2) Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Page et al. (hereinafter Page), U.S. patent 5,329,619.

3) In considering claims 1 and 7, Page teaches a method and machine-readable medium comprising:

- a) Receiving a request to perform a service transaction involving a plurality of service providers, and performing the transaction by remotely executing methods associated with the transaction including routing to a plurality of distributed networked software objects containing methods associated with the transaction via at least one link through a common network application functionally interposed between a client network access device and the plurality of networked software objects that controls the transaction, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

4) In considering claims 2 and 8, Page further teaches the transaction including communicating with a virtual information store via a network protocol to determine a network address for a networked software object. See col. 3, lines 55-61.

5) In considering claims 3 and 9, Page further teaches the transaction including using a stub object to enable remote execution of a method of a corresponding skeleton object that is associated with the transaction. See col. 14, lines 30-65.

6) In considering claim 4, Page teaches using the stub to interact with a networked software object of a first service provider and a networked software object of a second provider. See col. 14, lines 30-65.

7) In considering claim 5, Page teaches the stub created in real-time using a meta-compiler and transmitted to the broker. See col. 14, lines 30-65.

8) In considering claims 6 and 10, Page teaches performing an N-way interactive transaction among an integer plurality N of service providers. See col. 52, lines 46-52.

9) In considering claim 11, Page teaches a method comprising:

- a) Receiving a request to perform a transaction on a service network from a client access device, the service network including a first service provider and a second service provider, registering with an object router that routes to remote networked software objects associated with the transaction, creating links between the client access device and a plurality of nodes each having a software object associated with the transaction via a common hub that is functionally interposed between the client access device and the plurality of nodes by routing to the software object of each node, remotely executing methods associated with each software object, and receiving transaction results, (col. 3, lines 31-61).

10)In considering claim 12, Page teaches using an application-accessible virtual information store that contains an object identification and a network address assigned to each software object to determine the network address of each software object and route to the network address. See col. 3, lines 55-61.

11)In considering claim 13, it is inherent that the teachings of Page that the virtual information store includes using a distributed on-line service information base (DOLSIB). See col. 3, lines 55-61.

12)In considering claim 14, it is inherent that the teachings of Page that the network software object is accessed at the obtained network address. See col. 3, lines 55-61.

13)In considering claim 15, Page further teaches using a stub object that allows remote execution of a method of a corresponding skeleton object that is the software object at the node. See col. 14, lines 30-65.

14)In considering claim 16, Page teaches returning the transaction results to the access device via the hub. See col. 3, lines 36-42.

15)In considering claim 17, Page teaches executing a transaction involving a plurality of distributed networked software objects associated with service methods of each of a plurality of service providers by routing to each of the plurality of distributed networked software objects via a common network application that controls the transaction. See col. 3, lines 31-48.

16)In considering claim 18, Page teaches a system comprising:

- a) An interface to a client network access device to receive a request to perform a transaction from the access device, and a transactional application corresponding to the transaction, the transactional application functionally interposed between the client network access device and a plurality of service providers corresponding to the transaction to control access to and remote execution of methods associated with the software objects, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

17)In considering claim 19, Page further teaches the transactional application including a router that uses a DOLSIB to route to a plurality of distributed networked software objects each having a method associated with the transaction. See col. 3, lines 55-61.

18)In considering claim 20, it is inherent that the teachings of Page that a switch in an application layer of a layered network communications model switches to the transactional application after receiving the request. See col. 3, lines 36-48.

19)In considering claim 21, Page teaches a remote software object associated with the transactional application functionally interposed between the network access device and an enterprise computer system of a service provider participant to interface with the enterprise computer system and utilize data of the enterprise computer system in a method. See col. 3, lines 31-48.

20)In considering claim 22, it is inherent that the teachings of Page that the distributed software objects are object-oriented software objects. See col. 3, lines 31-36.

21)In considering claim 23, Page teaches a stub object corresponding to the geographically distributed software objects to allow remote access to the geographically distributed objects. See col. 14, lines 30-65.

22)In considering claim 24, Page teaches a system comprising:

- a) A server to store software and to execute software instructions, and hub means to control a service involving a plurality of service providers by

controllably routing to a plurality of software objects associated with the plurality of service providers, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

23) In considering claim 25, Page teaches the hub means including a network application and wherein the hub means is a hub means to route via at least one link through the common network application. See col. 3, lines 42-48.

Conclusion

1) The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Page et al., U.S. Patent 5,329,619 discloses a network transaction portal to control multi-service provider transactions.

2) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (703) 305-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (703) 308-6687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
8/11/04


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER